arXiv:1511.07285v1 [math.CO] 23 Nov 2015

CYCLIC GROUPS ARE CI-GROUPS FOR BALANCED CONFIGURATIONS

HIROKI KOIKE, ISTVÁN KOVÁCS, DRAGAN MARUŠIČ, AND MIKHAIL MUZYCHUK

Abstract. In this paper it is shown that every finite cyclic group satisfies the CI-property for the class of balanced configurations.

1. Introduction

Let G be a finite group. Following [14], a *Cayley object* of G is a relational structure with underlying set G which is invariant under all right translations $x \mapsto xg, x, g \in G$. Given a class $\mathcal{K}$ of Cayley objects of G, the group G is said to satisfy the *CI-property* for $\mathcal{K}$ if for any two isomorphic Cayley objects in $\mathcal{K}$, there exists an isomorphism between them which is in the same time an automorphism of G. The question whether a given finite group G satisfies the CI-property for a given class $\mathcal{K}$ of Cayley objects has been extensively studied under various choices of G and $\mathcal{K}$. Pálfy [14] characterized the finite groups satisfying the CI-property for all Cayley objects. It turns out that these are the groups $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z}_4$ and the cyclic groups $\mathbb{Z}_n$ with $\gcd(n, \varphi(n)) = 1$, where φ is the Euler function. A great deal of research was devoted to the CI-property of finite groups for digraphs, all which date back to Ádám's famous conjecture [1, Problem 2-10]. This was eventually answered in [10, 11, 12] where it was proven that the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_n$ satisfies the CI-property for digraphs if and only if its order is of the form $n = k$, $2k$, or $4k$, where k is an odd square-free number. For further information on arbitrary finite groups satisfying the CI-property for graphs and digraphs, we refer to the survey [8].

In this paper we expose a nontrivial and well studied class of combinatorial objects - the class of balanced configurations [4, 15] - for which, perhaps surprisingly, every finite cyclic group satisfies the CI-property.

First, an *incidence geometry* $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ consists of a set Ω of n points and a collection $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^\Omega$ of b lines (or blocks) such that $|B \cap B'| \leq 1$ for any $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$, $B \neq B'$. Then $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is called a *configuration* of type (n_r, b_k) (*combinatorial configuration* in the sense of [4]) if the following hold:

- $|\{B \in \mathcal{B} : \omega \in B\}| = r$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$; and
- $|B| = k$ for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $k \geq 3$.

The *automorphism group* $\operatorname{Aut} X$ of the configuration $X = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ consists of all permutations $g \in \operatorname{Sym}(\Omega)$ which leaves the set $\mathcal{B}$ invariant, that is, $\mathcal{B}^g = \mathcal{B}$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20B10, 20B25.

Key words and phrases. Cayley object, CI-property, cyclic group, balanced configuration.

The first three authors were supported in part by ARRS, the Slovenian Research Agency (research program P1-0285); the second and third authors thank ARRS (research projects N1-0032, N1-0038, J1-5433 and J1-6720); and the third author also thanks ARRS (I0-0035), and H2020 Teaming InnoRenew CoE. The fourth author thanks the University of Primorska for hospitality.

A configuration with $n = b$ (and therefore $r = k$) is called *balanced,* or a *k-configuration,* and its type is simply denoted by (n_k). In this paper we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Every finite cyclic group satisfies the CI-property for balanced configurations.*

Remark 1.2. It should be noted that some special cases of Theorem 1.1 have already been settled. Jungnickel [6] proved that finite abelian groups satisfy the CI-property for projective planes, while Koike et al. [7] proved Theorem 1.1 in the case when the cyclic group is of order a prime power or a product of two primes.

In our proof of Theorem 1.1 we follow the approach used in [13]. Let G be an arbitrary finite group, and X be any Cayley object of G. We say that X is a *CI-object* if whenever X is isomorphic to another Cayley object Y of G, there exists an isomorphism between X and Y which is at the same time an automorphism of G. Babai [2] gave the following group-theoretic reformulation of the CI-property: X is a CI-object if and only if the regular subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}\, X$, which are isomorphic to G, form a single conjugacy class of subgroups in $\mathrm{Aut}\, X$.

Following Li [9], we say that $G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is a *c-group* if it contains a regular cyclic subgroup (or a full cycle). In [13], the *partial order* $\prec$ on a set of c-subgroups was defined as follows: for c-subgroups $A, B \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$, let $A \prec B$ if $A \leq B$, and for every regular cyclic subgroup $L \leq B$, $L^b \leq A$ holds for some $b \in B$ (here and in what follows L^b is the conjugate subgroup $b^{-1}Lb$).

We say that a c-group G is *$\prec$-minimal* if it is minimal with respect to the partial order $\prec$. In this context Babai's criterion says that, a cyclic object X with a regular cyclic subgroup $C \leq \mathrm{Aut}\, X$ is a CI-object if and only if C is the unique $\prec$-minimal subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}\, X$. Since we can restrict ourselves to connected configurations only (see Section 2 for a detailed discussion), Theorem 1.1 is a corollary of the following statement.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $X = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is a connected balanced configuration and $C \leq \mathrm{Aut}\, X$ is a cyclic subgroup which is regular on Ω. Let $C \leq G \leq \mathrm{Aut}\, X$ be a $\prec$-minimal group. Then $G = C$.*

In Section 2 we give a number of lemmas which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 3.

2. Preparatory lemmas

Throughout the paper we keep the notation set in Theorem 1.3. Furthermore, we denote by D_m, SD_m and Q_m the dihedral, semidihedral and generalized quaternion group of order m, respectively (see, e. g., [3]). Clearly, the cyclic group C in Theorem 1.3 is of order $|C| = |\Omega|$. We let $n = |\Omega|$. Let n_p denote the largest p-power dividing n, where p is a prime. For a divisor d of n, let C_d be the subgroup of C of order d, and let $C_{p'} = C_{n/n_p}$.

Define the relation $R \subset \Omega \times \mathcal{B}$ by letting $(\omega, B) \in R$ if and only if $\omega \in B$. The corresponding undirected graph induced on $\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}$ with edge set $R \cup R^t$ is also known as the *incidence graph* of X. By R^t we denote the relation transpose to R, that is, $R^t = \{(\alpha, \beta) : (\beta, \alpha) \in R\}$. It is easily seen that R is $\mathrm{Aut}\, X$-invariant, and that there

are no points $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$ and lines $\gamma, \delta \in \mathcal{B}$ for which $\{\alpha, \beta\} \times \{\gamma, \delta\} \subseteq R$. In what follows we shall refer to the latter property of R by saying that R is *$K_{2,2}$-free*.

For a subgroup $K \leq \operatorname{Aut} X$, we denote by Ω/K the set of K-orbits of its action on Ω, and by $\mathcal{B}/K$ the set of K-orbits of its action on $\mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ be a balanced configuration of type (n_k). If $C \leq \operatorname{Aut} X$ is a cyclic subgroup which acts regularly on Ω then it acts regularly on $\mathcal{B}$ too.*

Proof. We have to show that C is transitive on $\mathcal{B}$. Assume the contrary, that is, C has more than one orbit on $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ be one of them. Then $n_1 := |\mathcal{B}_1| < |\mathcal{B}| = n = |C|$ implying that a subgroup C_{n/n_1} fixes each line $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$ setwise. Therefore each line from $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a union of C_{n/n_1}-orbits. In particular, if two lines of $\mathcal{B}_1$ intersect nontrivially, then they contain at least two common points. Since the relation R is $K_{2,2}$-free, such intersection could never occur, and so $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a partition of Ω. Hence $kn_1 = n$, implying that each line $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$ is just a unique C_k-orbit. Hence $\mathcal{B}_1 = \Omega/C_k$. Arguing in the same way for another C-orbit, $\mathcal{B}_2$ say, we conclude $\mathcal{B}_2 = \Omega/C_k = \mathcal{B}_1$, a contradiction. □

Let us recall that the configuration $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ in the above lemma is called *connected* if its incidence graph is connected. It follows from the above statement that the connected components of the incidence graph are permuted transitively by the cyclic group C. Thus the components are pairwise isomorphic, and, moreover, each of them is a balanced cyclic configuration by itself.

Since the configurations are isomorphic if and only if their connected components are isomorphic, this observation reduces the general case to the one with a connected incidence graph. In the rest of the paper we shall assume that the relation $R \cup R^t$ is connected.

Lemma 2.2. *With the notation of Theorem 1.3, let N be a normal subgroup of G such that $|\Omega/N| = |\mathcal{B}/N|$. Then N acts faithfully on its orbits on both Ω and $\mathcal{B}$. In particular, G acts faithfully on both Ω and $\mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. Notice that the assumptions of Therorem 1.3 and Lemma 2.1 guarantee that G is transitive on Ω and $\mathcal{B}$.

Pick an arbitrary pair $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in R$ and consider the N-orbits $\Delta_i = \delta_i^N$, $i = 1, 2$. Let N_{Δ_i} be the pointwise stabilizer of the set Δ_i in N. We claim that $N_{\Delta_1} = N_{\Delta_2}$. Indeed, if these subgroups are distinct, then we may assume without loss of generality that $N_{\Delta_2} \not\leq N_{\Delta_1}$. Hence N_{Δ_2} acts on Δ_1 nontrivially. Since N_{Δ_i}, $i = 1, 2$, are normal in N, the orbits of N_{Δ_2} on Δ_1 have the same size greater than 1. There exists $g_2 \in N_{\Delta_2}$ such that $\delta_1^{g_2} \neq \delta_1$. Therefore $|R^t(\delta_2) \cap \Delta_1| \geq 2$. It follows from

$$|\Delta_1| = \frac{|\Omega|}{|\Omega/N|} = \frac{|\mathcal{B}|}{|\mathcal{B}/N|} = |\Delta_2|$$

that $|R(\delta_1) \cap \Delta_2| = |R^t(\delta_2) \cap \Delta_1| \geq 2$. Let $\delta_2' \neq \delta_2$ be a point from $R(\delta_1) \cap \Delta_2$. Then

$$(\delta_1, \delta_2), (\delta_1, \delta_2') \in R \implies \{(\delta_1, \delta_2), (\delta_1, \delta_2'), (\delta_1, \delta_2)^{g_2}, (\delta_1, \delta_2')^{g_2}\} \subseteq R \implies$$
$$\{(\delta_1, \delta_2), (\delta_1, \delta_2'), (\delta_1^{g_2}, \delta_2), (\delta_1^{g_2}, \delta_2'\} = \{\delta_1, \delta_1^{g_2}\} \times \{\delta_2, \delta_2'\} \subseteq R.$$

This contradicts the fact that R is $K_{2,2}$-free. Therefore, $N_{\delta_1^N} = N_{\delta_2^N}$ holds for any pair $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in R$. By connectivity of $R \cup R^t$ we obtain that $N_{\Delta_1} = N_{\Delta_2}$ for any pair of N-orbits. Hence N_{Δ_i} is trivial. □

Lemma 2.3. *With the notation of Theorem 1.3, for any $(\alpha,\beta)\in R$ and arbitrary nontrivial $F\le C$ it holds that $\beta^F\not\subseteq\beta^{G_\alpha}$ and $\alpha^F\not\subseteq\alpha^{G_\beta}$.*

Proof. If $\beta^F\subseteq\beta^{G_\alpha}$, then $(\alpha,\beta^F)\subseteq R$ implies that $(\alpha,\beta^F)^F\subseteq R$, hence $(\alpha^F,\beta^F)\subseteq R$, a contradiction. The proof of $\alpha^F\not\subseteq\alpha^{G_\beta}$ is analogous. □

3. The proof of Theorem 1.3

We keep the notation of Theorem 1.3. The key step will be to describe the Fitting subgroup $F(G)$. Since G is a $\prec$-minimal group, it is solvable (see [13, Theorem 1.8]). Therefore, to get a description of $F(G)$ we first analyse the maximal normal p-subgroups $\mathbf{O}_p(G)$, where p runs over the set of all prime divisors of $|G|$.

Lemma 3.1. *With the notation of Theorem 1.3, let p be a prime divisor of $|G|$ such that $\mathbf{O}_p(G)\not\le C$. Then $p=2$, $n_2\ge 8$, and*

(i) $\mathbf{O}_2(G)\cong D_{2n_2}$ or SD_{2n_2}, and $C_{n_2}<\mathbf{O}_2(G)$; or
(ii) $\mathbf{O}_2(G)\cong D_{n_2}$ or Q_{n_2}, $\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_{n_2}\cong D_{2n_2}$ or SD_{2n_2}, and $|C\cap\mathbf{O}_2(G)|=\frac{1}{2}n_2$.

Proof. Fix a prime divisor p of $|G|$ with nontrivial $\mathbf{O}_p(G)$. In what follows we abbreviate $P=\mathbf{O}_p(G)$. Let p^e and p^f be the sizes of P-orbits on Ω and $\mathcal{B}$ respectively. By the symmetric role of Ω and $\mathcal{B}$, we may assume that $e\ge f$. If $f=0$, then P acts trivially on $\mathcal{B}$ implying, by Lemma 2.2, that $\mathbf{O}_p(G)=\{1\}$. Thus we may assume that $f>0$, which, in turn, implies $p\,|\,n$.

Let us consider the group PC_{p^e}. The orbits of PC_{p^e} on Ω have cardinality p^e and coincide with the orbits of C_{p^e}. We claim that the same holds for the orbits of PC_{p^e} on $\mathcal{B}$. Indeed, C_{p^e} permutes the orbits of P on $\mathcal{B}$, and the kernel of the action of C_{p^e} on $\mathcal{B}/P$ is a subgroup of order p^f. Thus an orbit of PC_{p^e} is a union of at most p^{e-f} P-orbits. Therefore, the upper bound for the size of a PC_{p^e}-orbit is p^e. Finally, this yields that the size of a PC_{p^e}-orbit on $\mathcal{B}$ is equal to p^e, and thus it must be equal to a C_{p^e}-orbit. Since $P\not\le C$, it follows that $PC_{p^e}>C_{p^e}$.

We prove next that $p=2$, $e\ge 3$ and

$$PC_{2^e}=\langle C_{2^e},a\rangle=C_{2^e}\rtimes\langle a\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where a is an involution that acts on C_{2^e} in such a way that for every $x\in C_{2^e}$, $x^a=x^{-1}$ or $x^a=x^{-1+2^{e-1}}$.

Since $C_{p^e}<PC_{p^e}$, we can choose a subgroup $C_{p^e}<N\le PC_{p^e}$ for which $N=\langle C_{p^e},a'\rangle$ of order p^{e+1}, a' is of order p, $N\cong\mathbb{Z}_{p^e}\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_p$, and a' acts on C_{p^e} by the rule $x^{a'}=x^m$, $x\in C_{p^e}$ where $m\in\{1,1+p^{e-1}\}$ if $p>2$ and $m\in\{\pm1,\pm1+p^{e-1}\}$ if $p=2$. Notice that, in the case when $m=1$, the semidirect product is equal to the direct product $N=C_{p^e}\times\langle a'\rangle$.

Let us consider first the case when $m\in\{1,1+p^{e-1}\}$. For $m=1+p^{e-1}$ the group is also called the modular group of order p^{e+1}, and denoted by $M_{p^{e+1}}$. In either case, the subgroups of N of order p generate an elementary abelian normal subgroup of order p^2. Let us denote this subgroup by Q. Below we consider N acting on $\Omega\cup\mathcal{B}$. Now, C_{p^e} is transitive on every N-orbit, hence $N=N_\omega C_{p^e}$ for any $\omega\in\Omega\cup\mathcal{B}$, $|N_\omega|=p$, and thus any orbit of N_ω has cardinality 1 or p. Let us fix an arbitrary element $\omega\in\Omega\cup\mathcal{B}$, and let $\alpha\in\Omega\cup\mathcal{B}$ be such that $\alpha^{N_\omega}\ne\{\alpha\}$. Then $N_\alpha\ne N_\omega$, hence $N_\alpha N_\omega=Q=N_\alpha C_p$, and

therefore,

$$\alpha^{N_\omega} = \alpha^{N_\alpha N_\omega} = \alpha^{N_\alpha C_p} = \alpha^{C_p}.$$

We have shown that every N_ω-orbit of size p coincides with some C_p-orbit. Set $\Delta = \mathsf{Fix}(N_\omega) := \{\alpha \in \Omega \cup \mathcal{B} : \alpha^{N_\omega} = \{\alpha\}\}$, let $\Delta_1 = \Delta \cap \Omega$ and $\Delta_2 = \Delta \cap \mathcal{B}$. Since, by Lemma 2.2, G acts faithfully on each orbit, Δ_1 is a proper subset of Ω and Δ_2 is a proper subset of $\mathcal{B}$. Notice that both sets Δ and $\Omega \setminus \Delta$ are nonempty. To get a contradiction, we show that R has no arc between Δ and $\Omega \setminus \Delta$. Indeed, if $(\alpha, \beta) \in R$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $\beta \in \Omega \setminus \Delta$, then $(\alpha, \beta)^{N_\omega} \subseteq R$ implies that $(\alpha, \beta^{N_\omega}) \subseteq R$. Since $N_\alpha = N_\omega$ and $N_\alpha \neq N_\beta$, we conclude that $\beta^{N_\omega} = \beta^{N_\alpha} = \beta^{C_p}$, hence $\beta^{C_p} \subseteq \beta^{G_\alpha}$, contradicting Lemma 2.3. If $(\alpha, \beta) \in R$ for some $\alpha \in \Omega \setminus \Delta$ and $\beta \in \Delta$, then $(\alpha, \beta)^{N_\omega} \subseteq R$ implies that $(\alpha^{N_\omega}, \beta) \subseteq R$. Since $N_\beta = N_\omega$ and $N_\alpha \neq N_\beta$, we conclude that $\alpha^{N_\omega} = \alpha^{N_\beta} = \alpha^{C_p}$, hence $\alpha^{C_p} \subseteq \alpha^{G_\beta}$, contradicting Lemma 2.3.

Therefore, $p = 2$ and $m \in \{-1, -1 + 2^{e-1}\}$ with $e \geq 3$. We claim that $N = PC_{2^e}$. Let L be the normalizer of C_{2^e} in PC_{2^e}. It follows from $C_{2^e} \trianglelefteq N$ that $N \leq L$. It follows from $PC_{2^e} = C_{2^e}(PC_{2^e})_\omega$ and $C_{2^e} \triangleleft N \leq L \leq PC_{2^e}$ that $L = C_{2^e}L_\omega$. By definition of L, we have $C_{2^e} \trianglelefteq L$. This gives us a homomorphism $\mu : L_\omega \to \mathbb{Z}_{2^e}^*$ defined by the rule $h^x = h^{\mu(x)}$ for $h \in C_{2^e}$ and $x \in L_\omega$. If there exists $x \in L_\omega \setminus \{1\}$ with $\mu(x) \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 4)$, then a unique involution $b \in \langle x \rangle$ satisfies $\mu(b) \in \{1, 1 + 2^{e-1}\}$. Now we can repeat the previous arguments for the subgroup $M = \langle C_{2^e}, b \rangle$ which yields $N = PC_{2^e}$ and (1).

Thus we may assume that $\mu(x) \equiv -1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 4)$ for all $x \in L_\omega \setminus \{1\}$. But this is possible only if $|L_\omega| = 2$. Thus $L = N \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2^e} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. If $N \neq PC_{2^e}$, then there exists an element $g \in PC_{2^e} \setminus N$ which normalizes N. It follows from $N \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2^e} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ that all elements of $N \setminus C_{2^e}$ have order at most 4. Since $e \geq 3$, the group C_{2^e} is characteristic in N. Therefore g normalizes C_{2^e} implying $g \in L$, contrary to $L = N$. Thus $N = PC_{2^e}$ and (1) holds. In particular, $[P : P \cap C_{2^e}] = [PC_{2^e} : C_{2^e}] = 2$.

Notice that the fact that $m \in \{-1, -1 + 2^{e-1}\}$ implies that the commutator $(C_{2^e}P)'$ has order $2^{e-1} \geq 4$.

Consider the group PC_{n_2}. It follows from $C_{2^e} \leq C_{n_2}$ that $[P : P \cap C_{n_2}] \leq [P : P \cap C_{2^e}] = 2$. Together with $P \not\leq C_{n_2}$ we obtain that $[P : P \cap C_{n_2}] = [P : P \cap C_{2^e}] = 2$. Thus $|PC_{n_2}| = 2n_2$.

Since the orbits of PC_{2^e} coincide with the orbits of $C_{2^e} \leq C_{n_2}$, the orbits of PC_{n_2} coincide with the orbits of C_{n_2}. Therefore, $PC_{n_2} = C_{n_2}(PC_{n_2})_\omega$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$. Counting orders we obtain $|(PC_{n_2})_\omega| = 2$. The same counting for the group PC_{2^e} yields $|(PC_{2^e})_\omega| = 2$. Therefore $(PC_{n_2})_\omega = (PC_{2^e})_\omega$. Let b denote the unique involution in the group $(PC_{n_2})_\omega$. Then $x^b = x^\ell$ for every $x \in C_{n_2}$, where $\ell \in \{\pm 1, \pm 1 + n_2/2\}$. If $\ell \in \{1, 1 + n_2/2\}$, then $|(PC_{n_2})'| \leq 2$ contradicting $|(PC_{2^e})'| \geq 4$. Therefore $\ell \in \{-1, -1 + n_2/2\}$. In this case the group $PC_{n_2} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \rtimes \langle \ell \rangle$. Therefore $PC_{n_2} \cong D_{2n_2}, SD_{2n_2}$. In both cases PC_{n_2} has two conjugacy classes outside C_{n_2}, say Y_1 and Y_2. Since P is normal in PC_{n_2} and $P \not\leq C_{n_2}$, at least one of Y_1 and Y_2 is contained in P. If both are contained in P, then $P = PC_{n_2}$ or equivalently, $[P : C_{n_2}] = 2$. This yields case (i).

Assume now that $P \neq PC_{n_2}$. Then P contains just one class, say Y_i. Then $\langle Y_i \rangle \leq P < PC_{n_2}$. For any choice of i, the subgroup $\langle Y_i \rangle$ has index two in PC_{n_2}. Hence $P = \langle Y_i \rangle$. Analysing all possible cases we obtain part (ii) of our statement. □

Theorem 3.2. *With the notation of Theorem 1.3, either $F(G) = C$, or $F(G) = \mathbf{O}_2(G) \times C_{2'}$ where $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ is described in Lemma 3.1.*

Proof. Recall that the Fitting subgroup $F(G)$ is a direct product of its subgroups $\mathbf{O}_p(G)$, where p runs over the set of all prime divisors of $|G|$.

It was shown before that $\mathbf{O}_p(G) \leq C$ if $p > 2$, implying that $F(G)$ is contained in $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \times C_{2'}$. If $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \leq C$, then $F(G) \leq C$. On the other hand, $C = C_G(C) \leq C_G(F(G)) \leq F(G)$, and we get $F(G) = C$.

Now, let $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \not\leq C$. Then $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ is given by parts (i)-(ii) of Lemma 3.1. We claim that $C_{2'}$ centralizes $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$. If $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \ncong Q_8$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{O}_2(G))$ is a 2-group (see, e. g., [3, Theorem 34.8(a) and (c)]), and the claim follows. Let now $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \cong Q_8$. Pick an arbitrary $g \in C_{2'}$. Then $(\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8)^g = (\mathbf{O}_2(G))^g(C_8)^g = \mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8$, hence g acts on $\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8$ by conjugation as an element in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8)$. As $\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8 \cong SD_{16}$, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8)$ is a 2-group (see, e. g., [3, Theorem 34.8(c)]), and we proved also in this case that any $g \in C_{2'}$ centralizes $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$. Then $C_{2'} \leq C(F(G)) \leq F(G)$, and so $F(G) = \mathbf{O}_2(G) \times C_{2'}$. □

We are now ready to prove the main result of the paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Recall that, C is a cyclic subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}\, X$ and G is a $\prec$-minimal subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}\, X$ which contains C. By [13, Theorem 1.8], G is solvable, so we can apply Theorem 3.2. According to this theorem either $F(G) = C$, or $F(G) = \mathbf{O}_2(G) \times C_{2'}$ where $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ is described in Lemma 3.1. If $F(G) = C$, then C is the only regular cyclic subgroup of G implying $G = C$ (by $\prec$-minimality of G).

We are left with the case when $F(G) = \mathbf{O}_2(G) \times C_{2'}$, where $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ is described in one of cases (i)-(ii) of Lemma 3.1. If case (i) occurs, then C is a unique cyclic subgroup of $F(G)$ of index two. Therefore C is a unique regular cyclic subgroup of G (if $\tilde{C} \leq G$ is another one, then by Lemma 3.1, $\tilde{C} \leq F(G)$).

Assume now that case (ii) of Lemma 3.1 occurs. Then

$$C_{n/2} \leq F(G). \tag{2}$$

Assume first that $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \ncong Q_8$. Then $C_{n_2/2}$ is a unique cyclic subgroup of $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ of order $n_2/2$. So, in this case $C_{n/2} = C^2 := \{x^2 : x \in C\}$ is a unique cyclic subgroup of $F(G)$ of order $n/2$. Therefore, for any regular cyclic subgroup $\tilde{C}$ of G it holds that $C^2 = \tilde{C}^2$. This implies that any regular cyclic subgroup of G centralizes C^2. Take now a subgroup $U \leq G$ generated by all regular cyclic subgroups of G. Then U centralizes C^2 and $U \prec G$. By $\prec$-minimality of G we obtain that $G = U$ which implies that $G \leq \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)}(C^2)$.

The group C^2 is semiregular on both Ω and $\mathcal{B}$ and has two orbits on each of these sets. We denote these orbits by Ω_1, Ω_2 and $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ respectively. Pick an arbitrary $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_1$. Since $k \geq 3$, the line β is incident with at least two points α, α' which are in the same C^2-orbit. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\alpha, \alpha' \in \Omega_1$. Since G centralizes C^2, the point stabilizer G_α fixes each point of Ω_1. Hence $\alpha'^{G_\alpha} = \{\alpha'\}$. Therefore any line $\beta' \in \beta^{G_\alpha}$ is incident with both α and α' too. Since R is $K_{2,2}$-free, we obtain $\beta^{G_\alpha} = \{\beta\}$. Therefore $G_\alpha \leq G_\beta$. Together with $|G_\alpha| = |G|/n = |G_\beta|$ we conclude that $G_\alpha = G_\beta$. Also, G_α fixes each element of $\mathcal{B}_1$ setwise, because $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a C^2-orbit of β. If a line $\beta' \in \mathcal{B}_1$ is incident with only the elements of Ω_1, then the lines of $\mathcal{B}_2$ are incident

with the points of Ω_2 only, contradicting connectedness of the incidence graph. Thus there is a point $\omega \in \Omega_2$ incident with β. Therefore the points of the set $\omega^{G_\beta} = \omega^{G_\alpha}$ are incident with β too. The group C^2 acts transitively on Ω_2 and commutes with G_α elementwise. Therefore, the orbits of G_α on Ω_2 coincide with orbits of some subgroup $F \leq C^2$. Lemma 2.2 implies that F is trivial. But in this case G_α acts trivially on Ω, and, therefore, is trivial. Hence $G = C$.

Consider now the remaining case $\mathbf{O}_2(G) \cong Q_8$. Since $F(G)_{2'} = C_{2'}$, it follows that all regular cyclic subgroups $\tilde{C} \leq G$ have the same odd part, that is, $C_{2'} = \tilde{C}_{2'}$ (see Lemma 3.1). Thus in order to prove that any two regular cyclic subgroups of G are conjugate, it is sufficient to show the conjugacy of their Sylow 2-subgroups. Notice that, according to Lemma 3.1 the Sylow 2-subgroup of C has order 8.

Let $K \trianglelefteq G$ be the kernel of the action of G on the imprimitivity system $\Omega/\mathbf{O}_2(G)$. The orbits of $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ have the same length which should be equal to 8 (otherwise the unique involution of Q_8 would act trivially). Since C_8 has the same orbits, we conclude $C_8 \leq K$.

Since K and $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ are normal in G, the centralizer $N = C_K(\mathbf{O}_2(G))$ is normal in G too. Since $\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ acts regularly on each its orbit $\Delta \in \Omega/\mathbf{O}_2(G)$, the centralizer of $\mathbf{O}_2(G)^\Delta$ in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Delta)$ has order 8. Therefore N^Δ is a 2-group for any $\Delta \in \Omega/\mathbf{O}_2(G)$ implying that N is a normal 2-subgroup of G. Hence $N \leq Z(\mathbf{O}_2(G))$ implying $|N| = 2$. Thus the group K/N is embedded into $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{O}_2(G)) = \mathrm{Aut}(Q_8) \cong S_4$.

As $\mathbf{O}_2(G) < \mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8 \leq K$ and K is not a 2-group, $|K| = 48$. As $\mathbf{O}_2(G)C_8 \cong SD_{16}$, different cyclic subgroups of order 8 are contained in different Sylow 2-subgroups of K. Since all Sylow 2-subgroups are conjugate and contain a unique cyclic subgroup of order 8, all cyclic subgroups of order 8 are conjugate in K.

□

We would like to end the paper with the following problem.

Problem 3.3. *Classify all finite groups which are CI-groups for balanced configurations.*

References

[1] A. Ádám, Research problem 2-10, *J. Combin. Theory* **2** (1967), 393.

[2] L. Babai, Isomorphism problem for a class of point-symmetric structures, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **29** (1977), 329–336.

[3] Y. Berkovich, Groups of prime power order - Volume 1, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 46, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin - New York, 2008

[4] B. Grünbaum, Configurations of points and lines, AMS, Graduate Studies in Mathematics vol. 103, 2009.

[5] M. Hladnik, D. Marušič, and T. Pisanski, Cyclic Haar graphs, *Discrete Math.* **244** (2002), 137–152.

[6] D. Jungnickel, The isomorphism problem for abelian projective planes, *Applicable Algebra in Eng., Comm. and Comp.* **19**, (2008), 195–200.

[7] H. Koike, I. Kovács, T. Pisanski, The number of cyclic configurations of type (v_3) and the isomorphism problem, *J. Combin. Designs* **22** (2014), 216–229.

[8] C. H. Li, On isomorphisms of finite Cayley graphs – a survey, *Discrete Math.* **256** (2002), 301–334.

[9] C. H. Li, Permutation groups with a cyclic regular subgroup and arc transitive circulants, *J. Algebraic Comb.* **21** (2005), 131–136.

[10] M. Muzychuk, Ádám's conjecture is true in the square-free case, *J. Combin Theory Ser. A* **72** (1995), 118–134.

[11] M. Muzychuk, On Ádám's conjecture for circulant graphs, *Discrete Math.* **167/168** (1997), 497–510.
[12] M. Muzychuk, Corrigendum: On Ádám's conjecture for circulant graphs, *Discrete Math.* **176** (1997), 285–298.
[13] M. Muzychuk, On the isomorphism problem for cycic combinatorial objects, *Discrete Math.* **197/198** (1999), 589–606.
[14] P. P. Pálfy, Isomorphism problem for relational structures with a cyclic automorphism, *European J. Combin.* **8** (1987), 35–43.
[15] T. Pisanski, B. Servatius, Configurations from a graphical viewpoint, Birkhäuser, 2013.

H. Koike, FAMNIT, University of Primorska, Glagoljaška 8, 6000 Koper, Slovenia
E-mail address: hiroki.koike@upr.si

I. Kovács, IAM and FAMNIT, University of Primorska, Glagoljaška 8, 6000 Koper, Slovenia
E-mail address: istvan.kovacs@upr.si

D. Marušič, FAMNIT, University of Primorska, Glagoljaška 8, 6000 Koper, Slovenia
E-mail address: dragan.marusic@upr.si

M. Muzychuk, Department of Computer Science and Mathematics, Netanya Academic College, University st. 1, 42365 Netanya, Israel
E-mail address: muzy@netanya.ac.il